

256. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of South Boston Yacht Club, of South Boston, Mass., favoring the repeal of 10 per cent tax on pleasure craft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

257. By Mr. VARE: Petition of vessel owners and captains association against Government operation of inland barges, provided for in the transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

258. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Samuel C. Osborn Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, protesting against an excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

259. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition adopted by Mandan Lodge No. 8, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of Mandan, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill, to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

260. Also, petition of Lodge No. 7, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of Valley City, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

261. Also, petition of Willow Lodge, No. 47, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of Willow City, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 22, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, O God, do we give our thanks, for in Thy hand do we live and move and have our being. Thou art a sun and a shield. Thou wilt give grace and glory, and no good thing wilt Thou withhold from them that walk uprightly. When the experiences of life come hard, and the head is bowed and the heart is heavy and the way is rough and long, bestow great strength and sweet peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. Any Members elect desiring to take the oath of office will now present themselves.

Mr. JAMES M. MEAD, Representative elect from the forty-second district of New York, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, under the special order I ask to be recognized for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to address the House for 25 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was agreed that if we had not completed the immigration bill the gentleman would not press the special order.

Mr. POU. Oh, no; the understanding was that if a vote was imminent I would not insist upon it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me say frankly to the gentleman that I am very anxious to hear him, and I think a very large part of the membership are anxious to hear him, and if he will defer his remarks I think we can have a vote prior to 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to the floor, if he desires it.

Mr. MONDELL. Just a moment. My understanding was that the gentleman from North Carolina was not to speak until this bill was finished.

Mr. POU. Oh, no; that was not the understanding.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with very great reluctance that I refrained from objecting to this special order. The situation now emphasizes the objectionable feature of such orders. There are many Members who desire to conclude consideration of this bill early to-day. It is highly important that we should conclude its consideration to-day. The gentleman can make his speech just as well after the bill is disposed of, and if he does it will accommodate very many gentlemen on both sides who are anxious to have this bill concluded at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. POU. The gentleman from Wyoming knows perfectly well that in all human probability this bill can not be concluded within the next two or three hours.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it can be concluded before 3 o'clock without unduly pressing its consideration.

Mr. POU. Certainly 25 minutes will not unduly delay its passage.

Mr. MONDELL. We hope to dispose of it by that time. There are quite a number of gentlemen on both sides who will be seriously inconvenienced if there is any great delay in the passage of the bill to-day. The gentleman can just as well make his statement and we will all be here and listen to it after the bill is disposed of; and I will say again, Mr. Speaker, that my understanding was that the gentleman should follow the consideration of this bill if the bill went over until to-day.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair recollects, the gentleman from Washington made the suggestion that if we had finished the debate on the bill and the vote was to be taken immediately after the reading of the Journal, the gentleman should postpone his remarks until after the vote was taken.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if the gentleman wants to insist, and create a situation under which in the future we must object to all of these special orders, he may do it.

Mr. POU. The gentleman can object if he wants to, but I am not going to surrender my rights under any such circumstances as these. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th day of this month an article appeared in the Washington Post, of which I ask the Clerk to read the marked portion.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOUTHERNERS HEAD HOUSE DEMOCRATS—MINORITY COMMITTEE PLACES ASSIGNED, WITH GARRETT ACTING FLOOR LEADER—REPLACE OTHER MEMBERS—ROSTER TAKEN TO MEAN WILSON MEN REGARD SOUTH AS STRONGHOLD FOR PARTY'S FUTURE.

(By the Associated Press.)

The claim by leaders that the South still is the backbone of the Democratic Party was indicated yesterday in the organization of standing committees of the House.

Except in two instances, and counting Kentucky and Missouri as part of the old Democratic stronghold, a southern Representative was named as ranking minority member of all committees.

This means, according to leaders, that if the Democrats should capture the House two years hence its machinery would be controlled wholly by the South. On many committees a southern Member also stood next to the ranking Democrat, and in some cases all minority members, in the list approved and selected, hail from Southern States.

MANY CHANGES MADE.

Many changes were made in some of the big committees, Representatives from the South taking the places formerly held by Democrats from other sections. There was a big rush for the Committee on Appropriations, but all aspirants could not be accommodated.

Representative GARRETT, of Tennessee, named by the Democrats as acting leader, already has taken over the work of the floor. Representative KITCHIN, of North Carolina, the Democratic leader, also is ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, which requires most of his time. Moreover, he is trying to conserve his strength after long absence due to illness, and it was at his request that Mr. GARRETT was made acting leader.

Four southern Democrats were elected to fill vacancies on the Judiciary Committee, which must handle legislation affecting prohibition.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, a report like that, going out through the Associated Press, ought not to pass unexplained, because it does a very grievous injustice to the section from which I come.

According to that statement, it would appear that certain gentlemen have been displaced from certain committees of the House and that their places have been taken by southern Democrats. As a matter of fact, there has been no such displacing of anybody. There are in this House 131 Democrats, and of that number about 20 come from States which are not a part of the so-called solid South. I have examined the record, and these gentlemen not only have no complaint to make, but they are burdened with work. I am going to read a list of the 21 Members who come from Northern or Western States, and their committee assignments:

HAYDEN, of Arizona, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, and Irrigation of Arid Lands.

LEA, of California, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RAKER, of California, Public Lands, Woman Suffrage, Irrigation of Arid Lands, and Immigration and Naturalization.

TAYLOR, of Colorado, Appropriations and Select Committee on Budget.

RAINEY, of Illinois, Agriculture.

SABATH, of Illinois, Foreign Affairs and Immigration and Naturalization.

KUNZ, of Illinois, Invalid Pensions, District of Columbia, and Mileage.

GOLDSBOROUGH, of Maryland, Banking and Currency, Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

LINTHICUM, of Maryland, Foreign Affairs.

TAGUE, of Massachusetts, Ways and Means.

GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, Appropriations.

RUCKER, of Missouri, Invalid Pensions and Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

HAWES, of Missouri, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

O'BRIEN, of New Jersey, Invalid Pensions, War Claims, and District of Columbia.

KINDRED, of New York, Rivers and Harbors.

CULLEN, of New York, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Railways and Canals, and Invalid Pensions.

RIORDAN, of New York, Rules and Naval Affairs.

SULLIVAN, of New York, Insular Affairs, District of Columbia, and Woman Suffrage.

COCKRAN, of New York, Foreign Affairs.

CAREW, of New York, Ways and Means.

CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania, Naval Affairs.

Some of these assignments are quite unusual, for we find several gentlemen beginning their first terms placed on some of the great committees of the House. This certainly shows that the South was not demanding everything. The truth is a new Member from a Northern or Western State stands a better chance to get on a great committee than a new Member from the South, and the South makes no protest.

Now, gentlemen, I respectfully submit that this list shows that southern Members in this body were not only not endeavoring to do anybody an injustice but that exactly the contrary is true. It proves that the Ways and Means Committee minority was honestly endeavoring to give every State recognition. There were two exceptions from the committee exclusion rule; that is to say, the rule of the majority which permits assignment to only one committee. Who are those exceptions? One of them is the gentleman from New York and the other the gentleman from Illinois; neither from the South.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him to say that Mr. GRIFFIN, of New York, was also put on Appropriations?

Mr. POU. Certainly, and the minority was glad to give him that assignment. There has been no complaint from the Democratic Members of the minority here who do not come from the South. Yet we find in this article this statement:

Many changes were made in some of the big committees, Representatives from the South taking the places formerly held by Democrats from other sections.

Those Democrats whose places were taken are not with us in this Congress. Unfortunately they are gentlemen who went down in defeat last November, I regret very much to say. I wish they were here. If they were, they would have the places to which they would be rightly entitled on these committees. Now listen at this also:

In many cases southern Members also stood next to the ranking Democrats, and in some cases all the minority Members on the list hailed from Southern States.

We have, as I have said, but 21 or 22 who do not come from Southern States. We have given them all the work they are willing to take. We are confronted by a condition and not a theory. It was impossible to distribute the committee assignments so that gentlemen coming from the North could be represented on all committees. The rule of the majority would not permit it.

Now, just a word in conclusion. I do not know whether you gentlemen will accept the statement at its face value or not, but it is the truth. So far as the South is concerned we are tired of the sectional issue, and no man can stand up in my State and draw the sectional issue and receive a respectful hearing.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING. We are not responsible for the newspaper article.

Mr. POU. I know you are not, and I have not charged the Republican majority with responsibility for it. And I want to say in justice to the Associated Press that it is the one instance within my recollection wherein that great organization has done what amounts to a palpable injustice to the section from which I come, and frankly I do not understand it. I said that the people of the South are tired of the sectional issue. We thought when the Spanish-American War was fought we would see the end of sectional charges and countercharges, but we were mistaken. We thought when the World War came on and our boys were going to the front that obliteration of sectional prejudice would be one compensation for the great sacrifice that was made. I saw many of these young men in my office during the early days of the war as they were on their way to Europe. They challenged my admiration. They went with self-sacrifice, with determination, and an utter disregard

of the result. I thought time after time, as I looked at the boys, there was "a look of Heaven upon their faces which limbers give to the beloved disciple." My own boy went and never returned.

The one compensation I thought I would have, when I was struck dumb with the news 13 days before the armistice was signed that I would never see him again, was that after all his sacrifice would not be entirely in vain. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we saw the whole sectional issue revived in the following election. What sacrifice is it that men and women of the South must make in order to end this feeling of sectional prejudice between the North and South; what must we do? Tell us, and, if possible, we will respond. We have rallied to the flag, our boys have done their best. They cheerfully offered their lives just as the boys from other sections offered theirs. And yet the sectional issue still lives. If Democrats win, whether true or false, the charge is made the South is in the saddle. If Democracy is defeated the plea is made, keep them defeated in order to keep the South out of the saddle. When all issues fail, when our opponents have no issue, sectionalism is revived. No men in America love the flag more ardently than the men on this side of the Chamber. When, in God's name, will the time come when political exigencies will not be such as to require this sectional issue to be raised again? It was used in the last campaign. It would seem to be the purpose to use it in the coming campaign.

I believe it is in Victor Hugo's writings, Mr. Speaker, that a beautiful little passage occurs. It has been a long time since I read it and I do not know that I quote it correctly. A young candidate for holy orders was being examined by the cardinal, and questions being addressed to him requiring a definition of faith, hope, and charity. The questions and answers, as I recollect, were given by that great author as follows:

Quid est fides?
Nondum vides.
Quid est spes?
Nondum res.
Quid est caritas?
Ah, magister, id est raritas.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately charity is indeed too rare. I leave with you this protest against the article which has been read by the Clerk by urging, as far as it lies in our power, all men from the North and the South to turn our backs forever upon this sectional issue that has torn our country to pieces in the past. Let us all stand united in the presence of the flag. If we can not win fairly upon economic issues, for God's sake let the party that has the better issues win; but as an American citizen I pray that the time may soon be here, if it is not here now, when we will hear no more about the North ruling the Nation or the South ruling the Nation. After all, any appeal to sectional prejudice is but an admission of weakness. [Applause.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill H. R. 4803, a bill to make appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was read a first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee reserved all points of order.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4075, a bill to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. STAFFORD in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending before the committee an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], which has been passed over temporarily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], which is also pending, may be considered ahead of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin be considered first, as if the amendment of the gentleman from New York had not been presented. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered last evening before adjournment, which is now pending, has for its purpose the securing of admission into the United States of the minor children of citizens of the United States who would be otherwise admissible under the immigration laws of the United States. The amendment was drawn containing language which was technically and strictly unnecessary, but I used the language in order to make its meaning perfectly plain, supposing that we were going to vote upon it last evening. I have since had a consultation with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], and he accepts the amendment substantially as I introduced it, but to be inserted at another place. Gentlemen will recall section 4 of the bill, which provides:

That the provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

The amendment which I desire acted upon is in the language which I now send to the Clerk's desk, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered last evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which he proposed yesterday before adjournment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Page 6, line 5, strike out "and minor children," and on page 3, line 20, after the semicolon, strike out "or," and on page 4, at the end of line 3, insert a semicolon and the following: "or (11) aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment just read must be clear to all. Numerous members of the committee have considered the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin and they have reduced the same to the words just reported, the object being that a clear exemption shall be made from the 3 per cent in respect to children, up to the age of 18 years, of citizens of the United States. We estimate that in all the world there can not be in excess of thirty or forty thousand of such persons. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to propose another amendment and ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do this, Mr. Chairman, in order to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON]. To make the language better I suggest that the gentleman from Washington consent to the insertion, on page 2, line 21, after the word "following," of the words "described classes." It would make the English better.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, I think that is an unnecessary amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is unnecessary, but it would make better English in a law of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The language of the bill is—

this provision shall not apply to the following—

And then the following are described by classes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending before the committee an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISHER]. Does the gentleman from Washington desire that to be taken up at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will again be reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER: Page 6, line 4, after the word "to," at the end of the line, add the following: "Wives, fiancées, parents, sisters, brothers, and minor children of ex-service men holding an honorable discharge from the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, who are eligible to citizenship and who served in the United States military or naval forces between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and to."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I now offer another amendment in lieu thereof, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER: Page 6, strike out lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées (1) of citizens of the United States, (2) of aliens now in the United States who have applied for citizenship in the manner provided for by law, or (3) of persons eligible to United States citizenship who served in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and have been separated from such forces under honorable conditions."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment incorporates the amendment which was under consideration last evening, and goes further by giving preference to American citizens and extending that preference to the wives, fiancées, parents, sisters, and brothers of American citizens. The amendment, as I understand it, if adopted, would indicate to our consuls abroad what preference should be given to those people applying for visés under the 3 per cent regulations. I further understand that this amendment has the sanction of the chairman of the committee. Inasmuch as we discussed the amendment yesterday concerning ex-service men, I think there is no longer any purpose in taking up the time of the committee in further discussion of it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If I understand the amendment, the gentleman omitted the brothers of ex-service men if they were under 18 years of age.

Mr. FISHER. No; brothers and sisters are included. The amendment of yesterday is incorporated in this amendment. It also liberalizes the amendment which I offered yesterday, by extending preference to all American citizens.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. I would say to the gentleman that the amendment practically can be of no effect and does not mean anything, for this reason—

Mr. FISHER. I yielded for a question, not for debate.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to make just a little point. The gentleman does not want to insert an amendment that does not mean anything. There are fifty-seven to fifty-eight thousand men who came from Poland alone in the service, and if this amendment should go through, how are you going to divide those men up, when under the 3 per cent proposition only 35,000 would be able to come in?

Mr. FISHER. I agree with the gentleman that this is only half a loaf. I made the fight yesterday to exclude the families of service men from the 3 per cent limitation, but was defeated in the House. The amendment may be only half a loaf, but, at least, it gives preference to ex-service men who have families who want to come in under the 3 per cent rule. This does not increase immigration to this country by a single person.

Mr. SIEGEL. The result of the amendment is this, that you are going to have service men against service men and raise a very beautiful and sweet question for the consuls over there, particularly in Poland.

Mr. FISHER. The operation of the system, as I understand it, is this: Every immigrant who desires to come into this country has to get a visé passport from the consul.

Mr. SIEGEL. Correct.

Mr. FISHER. Now, the passage of this legislation indicates very plainly what preference should be given. By the passage of this amendment we say to the consuls what persons come first.

Mr. SIEGEL. Correct; but if they have 56,000 and only 30,000 come in, 55,000 who are in the service from that particular part of the country, you are going to put the consul in a position where he makes a discrimination against men in the service.

Mr. FISHER. I want to say to the gentleman that we differ on this subject. This gives preference, that is all.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say to the gentleman right now that preference is no preference.

Mr. FISHER. I disagree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. SIEGEL. Of course, it is an old story. The gentleman's experience in that line of work is nil, otherwise he would not offer such an amendment.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. McCLINTIC. According to the amendment, would the parents of the wife who married the ex-soldier be admitted to the United States?

Mr. FISHER. No; they would not.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment, and I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman who proposed the amendment,

Is it the purpose of the amendment to give preference in the order named, one, two, and three, or is it the purpose of the amendment to put all in a class and give no preference? My point, if the gentleman from New York will yield, is that the amendment is subdivided.

Mr. FISH. I understand the question, and I think the House does. What is the gentleman's own opinion after reading the amendment?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I think it is ambiguous. My notion is that it does not give preference; that it is merely to designate classes which come within the exception.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman's opinion is that the three classes should stand together?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. FISH. That is my opinion.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I was just thinking if it was the purpose of the gentleman to give preference first to the relatives of a citizen of the United States; second, to the relatives of those who applied for citizenship; and third, that soldiers who were eligible to citizenship, it could easily be done, but if it is the purpose to put them in the same class I think it is a good purpose.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, of course the preference extended here by this provision comes out of the 3 per cent who are to be admitted, and, relatively speaking, it really does not make much difference whether there is preference given or not. But it is a maudlin sentiment that prompts this amendment, without any reason, without any justice, or without any cause. A man comes to this country, and he marries a foreigner. She comes to this country, and all her relatives—her parents, her brothers, her sisters—are admitted irrespective of what their views might be as to this country.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield. That is the meaning of the language. Let me read it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not understand that these people could be admitted.

Mr. RAKER. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not understand it that way.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I do not yield. I will read:

And that in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given, so far as possible, to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées of citizens of the United States.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It does not say wives—

Mr. RAKER. It does. A man who has married a foreign lady and brings her to this country, she is a citizen of the United States. What is the use of trying to misinterpret such plain English language. Her parents can come here; both her father and mother, her brothers, 5 to 10, can come here, and her sisters, 3 to 5, can come to this country in preference—now, listen—in preference to a man who is prepared financially and otherwise and who desires to make America his home, who has a reason to come and become a part of us. You would turn him down, but you put in here a sentimental proposition because some one in advance has come to this country and has married and has become a citizen, and you let that man or woman and their relatives come. Now, I am just calling attention to that because I possibly imagine this amendment may go through.

Another thing never recognized by our country and ought not to be recognized. We have been trying to avoid what is known as the "picture-bride" theory of bringing people to this country. But two countries of the world permit it, namely, Japan and Spain. We see now upon our statute books that every man who has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States may send abroad his picture or his love letter, and all the people that want to come in he and those like situated can bring in one apiece. The moment they enter our ports, it makes no difference. If he says that one is his fiancée, she is permitted to land. Why, gentlemen, this is mere sentiment and ought not to be engrafted upon a real American bill or legislation of this kind.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman contend that under this provision the Japanese could send for their picture brides?

Mr. RAKER. I want to say to the gentleman that I have not discussed the question, but when I get to it I will try to go into it fully. I simply say now that the American people have been asked by this proposition to allow people to be married by their pictures, one party in the United States and the other 7,000 miles away. It is not right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, I am sorry, but I must combat nearly all the statements made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER]. This is a bill limiting immigration to 3 per cent under certain conditions, and if you will read it you will understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. His amendment proposes to strike out:

Provided further, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given so far as possible to the parents and minor children of citizens of the United States, and to the parents, wives, and minor children of aliens who are now in the United States and have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law.

And insert the following for the last few lines:

The wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées (1) of citizens of the United States, (2) of aliens now in the United States who have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law, or (3) of persons eligible to United States citizenship who served in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and have been separated from such forces under honorable conditions.

Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. According to this bill, the term "United States" means also the Territories of the United States. The Territory of Hawaii is a part of the United States, and a citizen of Hawaii is constructively a citizen of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. During the war there were a great many Japanese who lived in Hawaii that went into the Army, and they afterwards received an honorable discharge. According to this amendment, would not they be allowed to bring their wives or the families of their wives into the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I think not.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I want to know why.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If we are going to express any preferences at all when we use the word "shall," then we have a right—call it sentimental or not, as you wish—to give those preferences to the people named here. We have undertaken by actual law to give those who put on the uniform of the United States certain rights and opportunities to become citizens. Two hundred and fifty thousand out of 400,000 have accepted, and others will accept. We are about to bring in a naturalization law to remedy certain defects in regard to soldiers.

In regard to the Japanese in Hawaii, I think about 400 waived alienage and went into our Army. Then a strange thing happened. While they were still in the Army, many of them, the armistice having been declared, desired brides. And according to the laws of Japan, in order to make application for picture brides, they had to step temporarily out of the barracks where they were serving as soldiers of the United States, go down to the office of the Japanese consul, and swear that they were citizens of Japan in order to fill out applications for picture brides. That is a peculiar situation.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Did they go back into the Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. They never stepped out of the Army. They stepped into the dual allegiance, an allegiance to the United States and the Army, and an allegiance to Japan while asking for brides. But I wish to say that the Japanese Government itself has suspended the picture-bride business.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am going to vote for this, but there is a question in my mind that seems to involve the operation of the amendment. I suppose if they are eligible to enter this country it is expected that when this bill becomes operative there will be a grand rush of applications to enter the United States. Suppose during the first month 1,000 people apply and only 100 of them are relatives of the soldiers; suppose after the second month, after the number is exhausted, some relative of the soldier applies, how is the preference going to operate in cases of that kind? Must the soldier's relatives file immediately or take their chances?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We are making conditions for a restriction of immigration. Here is the 3 per cent restriction. Here is what undertakes to be the direction. The assumption is that the Secretary of Labor will hand this direction which says "shall" to our consular agents who visé the passports issued by the other Governments to those trying to come to the United States. At some places people stand by hundreds in front of the consular offices. I assume that the interpreters of our Government will go among those people

before they go into the consular office at all and find out whether or not they come within these classifications. If they can prove that they come under the classifications, they may get the visé that will permit them to come to the United States, there to try to get through Ellis Island or other ports of entry.

Mr. CLOUSE. I would like to ask the gentleman if this measure is adopted, if it means anything, is it not possible to exclude desirable aliens from coming to our shores and admitting those of a less desirable class?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The words "desirable" and "undesirable" mean a great deal in a particular sense. No person considered undesirable under our present immigration laws can be admitted under this law, just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] suggested the other day. A person proposing to come to the United States begins by securing his passport from his Government. Then he strives for a passport from our consular agent. These are the initial steps of immigration from any country; it makes no difference whether it is Java, Portugal, or any other. That is where it starts, with the issuance of the passport. Then comes our visé; then the trip; and then the examination for entrance.

Mr. CLOUSE. The point I tried to bring out was this: Under this amendment, if it is adopted, is it not possible to admit a woman or a child who would be nonproducing in our country and deny the admission of that man who can make a living if he is permitted to come to America?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, if we are to hold immigration to only 3 per cent, and by that means take a whip hand on immigration coming to the United States, we think if we do succeed in holding immigration down under half a million, including all exemptions, the preference should be given to relatives of those already in the United States, either citizens or to be citizens, so that they may bring their relatives into the United States first—of course, all within the 3 per cent.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Washington a question. A lady from Russia, by reason of maltreatment by her husband, leaves him, with three children comes to the United States, and marries an American citizen. Those three children come with her. Under this provision here is the situation presented in Russia: One, a man of ability who wants to come to this country and become a real, genuine asset to it; and standing beside him is the father of this child, the father who maltreated the mother, and he can make a showing to come. Under this bill the real and worthy and genuine Russian can be denied admission, while this worthless, trifling father who deserted the child can be admitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course, that might be the case, but there is no way of preventing it. The one who best fulfills the requirements would come and the other would be denied.

Mr. SABATH. Such women and children are being admitted now.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not understand the situation about the fiancée.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me explain. The last Senate passed a bill admitting four fiancées, four girls who had become engaged to four Italians who fought in our Army. Those girls came and could not be admitted on account of illiteracy. The soldier boys who were engaged to those girls could have taken passage on the ship on which the girls could have been deported and gone out beyond the 3-mile limit and married them and returned later with those illiterate girls as wives. The House passed such a personal bill, giving relief, and would do it again. Now, if there is a preference at all there is no reason on earth why a man should not be permitted to express a preference for his fiancée, and there is no reason why she should not be able to impress the consular officer over there and receive preference from him.

Mr. STEVENSON. If she becomes an American citizen, then, do not all her relatives also become eligibles? In that case it would seem to be an endless chain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that is an endless-chain proposition, and it is to be hoped that it will be taken up later in a general law revising our statutes on the subject of immigration and naturalization.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is it not time to break the endless chain right here?

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. In such event it does not increase the 3 per cent, does it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "fiancés" be changed to "fiancées."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to change in the amendment the spelling of the word "fiancés." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (asked for by the Chair) there were—ayes 110, noes 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Page 4, line 3, after the word "faith," insert a new paragraph as follows: "(12)"

The CHAIRMAN. It should be, "After the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] add the following."

The Clerk read as follows:

"(12) Aliens who are fugitives or refugees for political reasons, which fact may be established by the verdict of a jury on an issue framed in a habeas corpus proceeding in a district court of the United States where such aliens may sojourn."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from California that the amendment I have offered will not increase immigration. It might at most permit the coming of a few unfortunates who are fleeing from political oppression or persecution.

Mr. RAKER. I would just as soon, in order to dispose of it at once, make the point of order now.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to be heard now.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it has been, and I hope it will continue to be, the traditional policy of our country to extend welcome to political refugees, and I hope we shall never deviate from this broad, liberal, and humane policy.

Every civilized nation has and is granting refuge to political refugees, and I can cite innumerable cases where our Government has refused to surrender political refugees upon the requisition of nations. The archives of the State Department will show the strongest documents from former Secretaries of State, including Jefferson, Fish, Webster, Clayton, Marcy, Bayard, Gresham, Frelinghuysen, and Hay, in refusing to surrender such refugees and, in other cases, offering this country as a haven of refuge to political offenders.

Not only the Secretaries of State but nearly all our Presidents have seen fit to give expression to our policy in their messages to Congress.

The Immigration Commission, appointed in 1907, to which the gentleman from Colorado has referred, made the most thorough investigation of conditions in Europe. Among other things they made the following recommendation:

In the judgment of the commission, as well as of most other enlightened citizens, the United States should remain in the future, as in the past, a haven of refuge for the oppressed, whether such oppression be religious or political. Any restrictive measure should contain a provision making an exception of such cases. We clearly ought not to close our doors against those whom the common opinion of the world would really consider the subjects of oppression.

President Wilson, in a message to the House and to Congress, had this to say on that question:

The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land, and who has yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils. The children and the compatriots of these illustrious Americans must stand amazed to see the Representatives of their Nation now resolved, in the fullness of our national strength and at the maturity of our great institutions, to risk turning such men back from our shores without test of quality or purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the full effect of this feature of the bill was realized when it was framed and adopted, and it is impossible for me to assent to it in the form in which it is here cast.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I had the time, I could read to you also extracts from messages of former Presidents Fillmore, Cleveland, and McKinley on that subject, but I do not think it is necessary. I feel that you will realize and appreciate the importance of this amendment, and inasmuch as it does not mean an increase of immigration, but only permits within a year the granting of asylum to at most a very limited few political refugees, who are subject to political persecution and to whom, if admission were denied, would mean certain death. For that reason I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Does the gentleman press his point of order?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. RAKER. Without going into it extensively, the point of order is that the amendment seeks to establish a procedure upon this bill which is a question of restriction of immigration. These are those who are permitted to enter over and above the 3 per cent, namely:

(11) Aliens, fugitives or refugees for political reasons.

In addition to that it proposes to add the following law:

Which fact may be established by the verdict of a jury on an issue framed in a habeas corpus proceeding in the district court of the United States where such alien may be sojourning.

First, it establishes a procedure in the courts in regard to habeas corpus that never has been in existence in the United States up to the present time, and from the beginning of jurisprudence never has been established in the courts of England or elsewhere. We have here an attempt to amend the laws relating to habeas corpus so as to provide that a man may have a jury trial upon his hearing. This would be new legislation, and therefore not permitted in this way.

Second, it does not exclude him, but he may come in at will. It repeals all of the law relating to the admission of aliens on this subject. But the man is in here. He is in the United States, and after he is in and after you have repealed the law you then ask for a trial on a writ of habeas corpus to determine that he unlawfully entered. That is all this is for. It—the present immigration law—is for the preventing of people from entering the United States who are not desired.

You could not get a writ of habeas corpus to go out upon one of the English or Dutch or Italian vessels and discharge a man from that vessel on a writ of habeas corpus. There can be no imprisonment, because the man came voluntarily on the Italian or other national vessel and he is on the high seas. He wants to be admitted. You admit him, and after you admit him you lay down a method of procedure to determine whether or not he shall remain in the United States, after you have voluntarily admitted him. It is a reversal of all of our law relating to the admission of aliens. There is a law upon the statute book now in regard to fugitives from justice, and so far as it applies to the 3 per cent they would be admitted.

The President first vetoed the bill, and, at the request of the committee, with the assistance of others, I drew the amendment which was approved by the Department of Justice and the Immigration Service, and it went into the bill and no objection was made, which permits fugitives from justice to enter the United States, and this is the proviso:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted or who admit the commission of or who teach or advocate the commission of offenses purely political.

But this amendment repeals that law.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I should like to complete my statement, but I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has read the exception in the immigration law. Now, this does not mean to enlarge it. It only provides that when the 3 per cent limit has been reached such aliens may enter. It was not intended in any way to abrogate or enlarge the provision.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I call particular attention to this proviso in the act of 1917. It defines what political refugees are. It is in consonance with the decisions of our courts and with the practice the world over. But here we provide—

Aliens, fugitives or refugees for political reasons.

That is, if Lenin and Trotski should be overthrown by the people of Russia, under this amendment that whole coterie of bolsheviks could come en bloc to the United States. Now, it is not possible that in this bill we are going to amend the present immigration law. It is not possible that we are going to permit such a condition to exist and amend the law without consideration.

Third, it is not possible that we are going to break down the fundamental procedure on the writ of habeas corpus, that

palladium of the liberties of the English-speaking people, which has been adopted by this country in both the Federal and State courts, and to say that a man shall have a jury trial on his demand.

Fourth, it is not possible that we are going to repeal the law and provide that a man can come to this country, and that after he is here somebody then may arrest him and say he ought to be deported. You could not deport him, because he would win his case. You would have admitted him voluntarily.

Fifth, I would reverse the present law and practice in regard to the admission of aliens. Transfer it from the Department of Labor to the Judiciary.

I say that there is every conceivable reason why this amendment should not be adopted on this bill, because it repeals the law now upon the statute books. It adopts a procedure in the courts and repeals the entire fundamental principles of the writ of habeas corpus and the present law and procedure in immigration matters. Again, it permits a man to enter here and be in the United States without the question of exclusion. I feel that the objection is fundamental to this amendment as it now stands, and that the point of order is well founded and should be sustained by the Chair.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COCKRAN. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] betrays an exuberant ingenuity which declines to be restrained by knowledge when he says that under no circumstances for which a parallel can be found in English law could a writ of habeas corpus issue on the application of a person seeking admission to this country. The gentleman must forget the memorable occasion in England when a writ of habeas corpus was issued for the body of Napoleon Bonaparte, then held aboard an English war vessel, on which he had made himself a voluntary prisoner. The authority to issue the writ—that is to say, the right to issue it—by the Court of King's Bench was never questioned. The admiral took another and more effective method of evading it. He kept his boat moving so that the marshal of the King's Bench could not serve the process. In the particular case we are considering this amendment proposes that if a person seeking admission to this country is restrained from entering it and makes the claim that he is a political refugee, it shall be competent to have the justification of that claim determined upon a writ of habeas corpus. When a man comes into this country he immediately passes into the hands of a public officer, the Immigration Commissioner. My friend from California seems to forget that the immigrant is in this country the moment he comes within the 3-mile limit. He is as much in the country while aboard a ship in our waters as when he has landed.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. If that is the fact—

Mr. COCKRAN. It is the law.

Mr. RAKER. If that is the law, why does not the party transfer from an Italian vessel to an American vessel and then come in?

Mr. COCKRAN. He is still subject to the immigration official whether on an Italian vessel or any other. He can not get past the immigration officials until he satisfies them that he is entitled to admission under the law; the nationality of the vessel in which he came would not make the slightest difference.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Would not the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois be subverted by turning over to page 3, and in the tenth exception, after the word "religious," in line 23, say "aliens who propose to satisfy the proper immigration officer or the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious or political persecution"?

Mr. COCKRAN. I think the gentleman from Illinois would accept that suggestion.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Then there would no point of order lie against it.

Mr. COCKRAN. I understand the provision for a habeas corpus was added to the substantive feature of the amendment for the purpose of guarding against abuse if it be adopted. In other words, if when anyone claimed to be a political refugee and the claim was disputed that issue of fact on which his right to admission depended would be determined by a judicial proceeding. It is perfectly proper under a habeas corpus pro-

ceeding to inquire as to any matter of fact that might be involved, and the court can make that inquiry itself or by a jury or a referee.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. With pleasure.

Mr. MILLS. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York whether a jury trial to determine whether the immigrant is properly in this country or not is not a reversal of the existing practice which makes it a matter of administrative decision, and if it is not an entering wedge?

Mr. COCKRAN. That objection of the gentleman from New York applies to the merit of the proposal but not to this point of order. There is much in what my colleague says; I admit there is great force to his objection to conducting such an inquiry by habeas corpus, but we are discussing not the advisability of proceeding by habeas corpus but the power to introduce such a provision into existing law by this amendment. This procedure is suggested only to meet a very extraordinary condition. I am sure that my colleague, who is a much more experienced lawyer than his years would seem to suggest, is aware that when any matter of fact comes before the court in a habeas corpus proceeding it is within the power of the court to reach a conclusion of fact in any way it likes. I was concerned once in a memorable case wherein the question was raised on habeas corpus whether execution by electricity was likely to result in burning the criminal to death and therefore within the constitutional prohibition of a cruel and unusual punishment. That question of fact was referred to a referee; testimony was taken for a year and the court finally passed upon it according to the findings of the referee on that testimony. It surely would have been equally competent for the court to empanel a jury and try the same question by that method.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. The distinguished gentleman does not want to leave me in this attitude. The court can do a great many things but that practice is unusual.

Mr. COCKRAN. I admit the unusual practice, but I think my friend from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will agree to avoid the whole question involved in the point of order by accepting the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], and insert the provision in another place in the bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite matters, as I understand it is the desire of a great many Members to get through early in the day, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting after the word "religious," in line 23, page 3, the words "religious or political."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is an amendment to an amendment which has been agreed to by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the mover of the amendment that this committee amendment has been amended by striking out the very language he refers to and substituting other language, and therefore it is not before the House.

Mr. SABATH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, at the end of the Cooper amendment, insert the following: "aliens who are fugitives or refugees for political reasons."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, what is the amendment?

Mr. SABATH. It is the same that I offered heretofore, with the exception that we strike out the proviso to which the gentleman objected, and in view of that I hope that he will agree to the amendment. The objectionable part has been eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman press the point of order?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make the point of order. I think the objectionable part of it has been withdrawn.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, would the ex-Kaiser of Germany be permitted to enter this country? Would we not be obligated to afford him protection as a political prisoner?

Mr. COCKRAN. He is a refugee from us. We do not give political asylum to refugees from ourselves.

Mr. BEGG. But the amendment does not say that. It simply says political refugees, and he is a political refugee.

Mr. COCKRAN. But not seeking asylum. A political refugee does not seek asylum in the country from which he is a refugee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the question by asking the gentleman another. Does he believe that the ex-Kaiser will do so or endeavor to do so?

Mr. BEGG. It is not a question of what the gentleman believes. It is a question of what the amendment permits. If I understood the amendment, it provides that we shall afford a haven for all political refugees who gain access to this country. I want to know why the Emperor of Austria and why the Kaiser would not be by law protected in this country were they to enter it.

Mr. SABATH. I do not think so, but if there is any question in the mind of any gentleman about the wording of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that I may add to the amendment the following:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted or who admit the conviction or who teach or advocate the commission of an offense purely political.

That is the present law.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean to say that if a man threw a bomb at the head of a government we would admit him in order to prevent his being prosecuted?

Mr. SABATH. That would not be purely political.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment offered by Mr. SABATH by inserting, after the word "reasons," the following: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted or who admit the commission or who teach or advocate the commission of an offense purely political."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois to so modify his amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I am not absolutely sure that I understand the amendment even now, hence all I have to say will be on the question as I understand it. The amendment as offered is supposed to provide a haven for political refugees, from whatever country they may hail, on certain conditions, and I can not feel that the conditions prescribed in the amendment offered by unanimous consent will exclude a man like the ex-Kaiser of Germany or the ex-Emperor of Austria and Hungary, or any other of that class of political prisoners. I simply want to make one appeal to this committee for America. There is an undue interest, it seems to me, for men of foreign birth, foreigners. I have all the sympathy that any man can have for a foreigner. If this Government had been too drastic 60 years ago, I would not be here myself, and I want no action of mine to work a hardship upon any foreigner of any race or religious conviction unless by extending to him the privileges of this country I shall thereby mar or handicap the future for my children in this country.

In other words, the interest of Poland, Russia, or Austria-Hungary, or Ireland, or any country I place second to the interests of the United States. [Applause.] I believe that the American people to-day want a limit placed on immigration, and I believe it is for the best interests of this country to now limit immigration for a time, until we can arrive at a condition in this social fabric of ours where we can transform the foreigner into an American, with an American's ideals, and make him a supporter of our Government rather than a drag on its progress. I take it there is not a man in this House who has any other opinion than that.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will gladly yield.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Does the gentleman think that under existing immigration laws the Kaiser or Emperor of Austria could be admitted to our shores?

Mr. BEGG. Certainly he could not.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Does not this amendment leave the law just as it is at present?

Mr. BEGG. I made the statement very frankly that I did not know, and I do not believe anybody else in the House knows what can be done under this amendment as introduced.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. It is an addition to the list of those persons not affected by the 3 per cent provision.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will permit, I would say that if you are trying to help any particular man like O'Callaghan, in the name of heaven why do not you come out flatfooted and say so and not make a general provision that will admit men whom we do not want in this country? [Applause.] That is the position I take. We are confronted right now with a proposition of trying to limit immigration by legislation in some such way as to benefit society and the people we already have. Let us not muddy the waters by trying to provide some loophole whereby some particular individual can remain in this country or get in under legal right. If you want to assist any particular individual let us meet the proposition on its merits, face to face, and say what we are going to do. As far as I am concerned I want restricted immigration until socially and economically in this country we have solved some of these very potent problems that are confronting our civilization. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is, as to whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] withdrew his first amendment, which merely referred to fugitives and refugees for political reasons, or has he asked to add to it the provision which has been read from the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the situation as to the amendment, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] originally offered his amendment as follows:

Or (12) aliens who are fugitives or refugees for political reasons.

After that was reported, and still having the floor, he asked unanimous consent to add an amendment to the amendment, which consent was granted, and he added the proviso which the gentleman from Washington has just read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say I did not understand he asked unanimous consent to do that. I thought it was a substitute or I would have made a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is very clear in his recollection that in submitting the unanimous-consent request he waited the customary time for any gentleman to reserve or make a point of order, but no one did so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the Sabath amendment and the amendment he secured by unanimous consent, which we did not understand on this side, be read as it will read if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington submits a unanimous-consent request that the amendment be again reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, after the Cooper amendment insert: "Or (12) aliens who are fugitives or refugees for political reasons: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude otherwise admissible persons convicted or who admit the commission, or who teach or advocate the commission of an offense purely political."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I rise to oppose the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment is now a double-headed proposition which means nothing.

Mr. SABATH. It is in the wording of the present law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will let the proponents defend the provision in their time, and I will hold the floor for a couple of minutes. I say that a double-barreled proposition has been presented that does not mean anything. Now, a word as to political refugees. We are undertaking to reduce for 14 months immigration to 3 per cent. If there are political refugees escaping from possible death in some foreign countries who reach the United States they can be taken care of under that per cent, but when you propose to permit under temporary suspension during the next 14 months what happened in the last two or three years in the case of the anarchist, Magoon, who fled from Mexico claiming there was a price on his head and who, when he got to Los Angeles, set up an anarchist paper that is still running. We are unable to deport him because he is a refugee. We were unable to deport him all these last two or three years because the then Assistant Secretary of Labor said that he could prove the man was not an

anarchist even though the man said that he was an anarchist. We are tired of these things in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield the floor.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is not in order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, it would seem from the arguments which have been made upon the floor of the House during the consideration of this bill that every Hebrew in this country was against it, and for that purpose I rise to state that such certainly is not the case in my district in Baltimore. I have before me a letter, or rather a copy of a letter, which was sent to me yesterday and which I received to-day from Rev. Morris S. Lazaron, who is the rabbi of the oldest and largest congregation of Jews in Baltimore. This letter was addressed to the Secretary of State.

I shall only read part of it, because the balance is in reference to another letter which he wants introducing him abroad, but the part which applies to this bill I shall read to you for your information.

The letter is as follows:

BALTIMORE, Md., April 21, 1921.

His excellency CHARLES EVANS HUGHES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. HUGHES: It is with great interest that I read your communication regarding the necessity for an immediate restriction of immigration. Naturally, as a Jew and rabbi, my heart goes out in sympathy to my coreligionists who have been the victims of the chaos in southeastern Europe. Indeed, this is but a human sentiment which everyone will share.

However, as an American and considering the problem from the point of view of the effect of unrestricted immigration upon our country, I am convinced of the rightness of your stand. Over a month ago, in a number of public utterances, I took the same position. I write in this way for no other reason than this: That there will be much criticism of your declaration and I would have you know that many see four square with you. The problem of Jewish congestion in the large centers, the problem of unnaturalized foreigners, is at present acute enough. Until we have a statesmanlike, organized program to meet the present difficulties, we have no right as American citizens to let down the bars entirely. The reunion of families is a question to which attention may be given in each particular case and decision made on its merits.

Now, I want to say in reference to Rabbi Lazaron that we have no rabbi in this country of better standing and greater learning, who has given more study to this subject. He has traveled practically the world over, and in this very letter he desires to obtain a letter which he can use in a proposed trip to Palestine, in order to gather further information in that section and in southern Europe. When he says it is unwise to grant unrestricted immigration, I regard his opinion as of as great importance as any man in this country. [Applause.] Now, from the remarks yesterday one would gather that the American people were no longer able to work and wait upon themselves. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] said that during the war that the people of foreign birth made our shoes and clothing—

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will yield.

Mr. SIEGEL. I made no such statement, and the gentleman can not point at any time to anything I said on the floor of this House where I dragged in any particular faith.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Perhaps the gentleman said immigrants.

Mr. SIEGEL. I regret to say the gentleman drew a wrong inference from what the gentleman from Indiana said. I made no such statement, and I do not think the gentleman from Indiana intended that inference should be drawn.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Perhaps the gentleman said that the immigrants of this country made the clothes and shoes which clothed and shod the Army, but certainly the expression was made.

Mr. SIEGEL. Not by me.

Mr. LINTHICUM. They tell us we need the immigrant to manufacture clothing, hats, and shoes of the country; others say that we must have them to go upon the farms and produce the food for our people; others tell us we must have the foreigners to do the work in the great industries of the land; and still others say they are necessary to do the housework in the homes of our country.

For heaven's sake, gentlemen, what are we Americans to do while these people work for us and wait upon us? Would it

not be better to Americanize and assimilate the great mass of foreigners we already have and find work and occupations for them, to school them, and teach them the things for which America and the Constitution stand? After that, if we feel there is time to assimilate more of them, it will then be in order to open the gates to those who desire to become good and substantial citizens.

I do not wish to see Americans sit and become opulent, inactive, and weak. I wish to see them blaze their way through civilization by work and effort, as they have ever done in the past; to become strong and powerful through work and opportunity. I do not wish our people to rest while others do the work, to sit in palaces and high places and wear soft raiment. Through work and energy we become strong. America has won its place in the world by clearing the fields, building the railroads, erecting churches and schoolhouses, and laying the present foundation of the greatest civilization. To become soft is to become decadent. Let us instill into the minds of every American, whether native or foreign born, that this is the great land of opportunity, where work counts and perseverance wins success. [Applause.]

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we can arrange time for debate on this section and all amendments thereto. I want to suggest that the debate close in 30 minutes—I think there will be no objection to that—the time to be divided into five-minute periods to those who can secure recognition from the Chairman.

Mr. SIEGEL. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will permit the Chair to submit the unanimous-consent request. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 30 minutes, the time to be allotted for speeches to be not more than five minutes each?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the time to be under the control of the Chairman?

Mr. SIEGEL. Will that be on all amendments or on the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. On the pending amendment, as the Chair understands. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Washington—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will see if we can not make the time a little longer and make it to include all the amendments to the section. Let us see if we can not agree on 40 minutes on this section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the time to be allotted in periods of not more than five minutes and the time to be at the discretion of the Chair. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington if he will grant to me the first two minutes to read from the RECORD what I referred to as having been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] on this proposition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the RECORD will show that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, then I move that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves that debate on the section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the indulgence of the committee has been so conspicuously displayed in my favor that I hesitate to obtrude myself on this debate. I should not do so if it were not that I deem it absolutely necessary to answer something that was insinuated rather than said by the gentleman who spoke before the last speaker. He seemed to think it necessary to profess that a Member of this House in casting his vote would put America first. If I thought such a profession was necessary from anybody here, I would be a little ashamed of my companionship. I venture to say that nobody who is fit to sit in this House would consider any question at any time except that of America's interest first, last, and all the time. [Applause.] No question affecting any foreign country or the inhabitants of any other part of the globe should be

considered for a moment by anyone honored by the people with a seat in this body except in so far as it could advance the interests of the American people or the dignity of American citizenship.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is reduced to a very narrow compass, and I am sure when it is understood there will be no dissent in any part of the House. The gentleman to whose speech I have just referred pictured the possibility of the Kaiser coming here if this amendment be adopted. If his assumption be correct, it is difficult to conceive a stronger reason for adopting the amendment. I fancy if we knew how we could get the Kaiser and bring him here we would not wait for him to come but would send a ship for him. The gentleman proceeds upon the extraordinary theory that if the amendment prevails refugees would seek the country from which they were refugees. It is impossible to discuss a supposition of that character. The Kaiser is an offender against our laws. Holland holds him to-day against our request for his surrender. If the condition which the gentleman pictures could possibly occur, this country would gladly receive him to put its hands upon him, not in the way of kindly welcome but in the way of bringing him to the bar of justice to answer for his offenses against humanity and all international law.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. If it is not taken out of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it would be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. COCKRAN. Then I can not yield. If given sufficient time, I would yield to anybody.

I have but to say this: This measure simply provides that the provisions of this proposed law shall not apply to political refugees, and that the existing law defining what is a political refugee shall govern application of the new law. If that amendment be not adopted, then we have abandoned not merely the traditional policy of this country but the policy of every civilized country.

Now, picture to yourselves the condition which will ensue if this exception should not be made. The gentleman spoke of Trotsky coming here as a possibility sufficiently liable to justify rejection of this amendment. But suppose that some of Trotsky's victims come here seeking to escape his vengeance? Gentlemen, remember I am not speaking now with any claim to knowledge of actual conditions in Russia. I do not know what they are. But if they be anything like what they are generally stated to be, and some man who had been engaged in an attempt to overthrow this domination of 600,000 over 120,000,000 by blood, force, and murder, succeeded in escaping from Russia and reached these shores he would be denied admission if he happened to be one over the 3 per cent allowed.

If this bill had then been in operation some generations ago Kossuth could not have been landed here. John Mitchell, the grandfather of a man believed by many to have been the ablest mayor New York City ever had, could not have landed here. Thomas Francis Meagher, whose statue stands to-day outside the capitol of the State of Montana, an incentive to the youth of that State to fix their notions of civic virtue by his example, could not have landed here. If enacted, you will have the world reduced to this condition, that however desperate might be the peril, however frightful the persecution to which people of another country might be subjected, a fugitive from those dreadful countries would be sent back by the hand of our officers to expiate in his own person our renunciation of the principles of civilization which we were supposed to embody in the highest degree during all our existence. [Applause.]

I think, Mr. Chairman, merely to state that proposition is to insure the action of the House in advance, and so in perfect confidence I submit the amendment to the judgment and discretion of the committee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma amendment, and moves to strike out the last two words. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members of this House, I have listened with great interest to the arguments, both in behalf of and in opposition to the pending bill, but I am frank to say that I have not been convinced that this bill should be defeated. But I maintain that it should be strengthened, rather than weakened by the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. [Applause.]

When we look about us we see in this country to-day no less than 5,000,000 idle men. We see our factories and workshops and farms abandoned. Our production is curtailed to a point that is indeed alarming. And yet it is sought here on the part of some to open the floodgates of this glorious Republic to immigration, and perchance to bring to our shores within the next 12 months not less than 2,000,000 aliens to come in direct competition with American labor.

I say to you that this is no time to temporize on this question. We should take it up from an American standpoint and not vote in order that our vote will be against some ex-service man or in favor of him, but let us look to this question purely as an American one and provide for the best interests of the American people as a whole. Why, some Members have gone to the point of saying—and indeed I have gathered from their remarks—that they regard the United States as no larger than their congressional districts. I happen not to come from a district that has a large foreign population, yet I want to say to you that if I did I would stand for the interests of America as a whole, regardless of the wishes of my constituents. [Applause.]

I say to you not only have we millions of idle men but we read in the press of this week that there have been in the past four months no less than 9,000,000 American laborers who have left the industrial centers of our country and returned to the smaller towns because they could not find gainful occupations in the congested centers and manufacturing cities.

Not only that, but we have standing now on rusting rails in railroad yards a quarter of a million idle box cars, and yet it is proposed to bring aliens here by the thousands and tens of thousands, to furnish them gainful occupations, when our own people are starving for lack of work.

I appeal to the membership of this House to vote down this amendment and give us legislation that will protect us in our immigration. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RYAN offers the following substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Page 4, line 3, after the Cooper amendment, insert "or (12) aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are actual subjects of persecution for political opinions and are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping suffering and hardship involved in such persecution."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am offering this substitute amendment not for the purpose of bringing in additional immigrants to this country. I think that if we are to accept an amendment in behalf of aliens who are subject to persecution or prosecution because of their religious belief, we should have an amendment admitting people who are persecuted because of their political faith.

I do not know about the conditions in Russia or Serbia or other countries in what is known as the Near East, but I do know that there is persecution in certain countries of Europe, and if political offenders had been barred from the United States in former days the forebears of a great number of the men present in this House would never have reached America, and they would be in Europe to-day working as the prospective immigrant over there is now working. I believe we should act in justice and in fairness to others as we would like to see justice and fairness done to us. During the World War we promised men of foreign birth who engaged in that war on our side that we would not discriminate against them or against their parents. A large number of them were sent to the front who could not speak English, but they were told that justice would be done them. Without getting away from the 3 per cent rule, we could take care of them.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If your amendment were adopted, what would prevent any alien from coming in here under the pretense of being subject to political persecution? What would prevent him from coming in?

Mr. RYAN. The immigration officer in charge of that very matter would be the sole judge of that, as he is to-day.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Are communism and bolshevism political doctrines?

Mr. RYAN. I believe they are.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Then, if there are restrictive rules against communists and bolshevists in some other countries of

the world, they could flee to this country and find here an asylum under your amendment.

Mr. SIEGEL. My understanding of the rulings is to the effect that you have to establish your facts in every particular case.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I am talking about general principles.

Mr. RYAN. I believe one of the great principles upon which this Government is founded is that we should give asylum to those who are being persecuted because of their religious or political beliefs.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Only in so far as we may do that and still preserve our own safety, and bolshevism is subversive of our form of government, and I do not believe in letting that kind of people come in.

Mr. KNOTSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not hope to contribute but little to the consideration of this bill. I expect to vote for the bill, and I expect to vote for it notwithstanding my very great reverence for the preservation of the traditional political asylum incident to our institutions. My vote will tend to prevent the overthrow of those principles. I vote to prohibit the entrance into our Republic of people whose purpose and activity are directed to the one end of undermining the foundations upon which such a tradition rests, as well as all other principles of the American Government. [Applause.]

But there is another aspect of the case I would ask the committee to consider, somewhat cognate to the bill itself. There is an old maxim of our jurisprudence that he who asks equity must do equity; that he who comes into a court must come with clean hands. If we would exclude with vigor, should we not deal in somewhat similar manner with those we have already within our borders? If we would keep out danger, should we not keep down danger already within our domain? Only a few years ago there were nine American States that permitted unnaturalized aliens to vote. I do not know the number of such States now.

Mr. SIEGEL. There are only four now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thank the gentleman. Those States permit aliens to vote, not only in State but in Federal elections. I have offered a constitutional amendment that has been pending in a committee of the House for some four years which provides that no person shall vote at any election for Representatives in the Congress, or Senators, or electors of the President unless such person is an American citizen. [Applause.] I am very much gratified to know that during this time there has been some march of improvement in the States in respect to this dangerous use of the ballot by foreign and unnaturalized citizens. My political principles are founded more or less upon what is known as the state-rights school.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; I regret I can not yield. But the American Constitution gives Congress the right to deal with naturalization, and I think the amendment I have suggested only perfects this right of the Congress to deal with this vastly important subject. This suggested amendment withdraws citizenship from no man; it only provides that the foreigner must be first naturalized before he shall vote in Federal elections, not State elections.

I am happy to know, as stated by the gentleman from New York, that there are now only four such States conferring this abnormal right upon foreign subjects as citizens; but when I introduced the amendment there were some eight or nine States of the Union that gave the right to unnaturalized aliens to control the destinies of the American Nation. I thought this aspect of the immigration question would not be wholly unwelcome to the patriotism of this body at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House a little over six years. I have served on the Immigration Committee from the time I came here. In no debate up to this one has the question of the religious faith of any particular part of the people in this Republic ever been brought up for discussion here, and it is most regrettable that any man, no matter who he is, should undertake to raise such a question on the floor of this House. I say that such a man is no American, whether his citizenship is by nativity or through naturalization. It is a pretty sorry day for our institutions in this country when any man representing a congressional district rises here upon the floor of the House and endeavors to discuss the faith of any particular part of our citizenship. I want to say to my friend from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] that his is one of the four States where aliens arrive and take out their first papers and then vote for Members of Congress and for all other offices of his State. The other States are Texas, Missouri, and Arkansas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say that Texas is engaged in, I hope, a successful effort to correct that situation.

Mr. SIEGEL. I hope that they succeed. I will say to the credit of the gentleman from Texas on our committee [Mr. Box] that he has informed me a number of times that the members of the Texas delegation are working very hard along these lines. I may differ with him upon policy, but he is consistent in his views.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. While the gentleman is entirely correct in saying that there are only four States where noncitizens are entitled to vote, the gentleman must remember that in his own State and in his own city a Congressman represents, in fact, a great number of alien population.

Mr. SIEGEL. Let me say to the gentleman that the truth of the matter is that in the Southern States there are more people unrepresented here, and that they do not vote in those States when they should be permitted to vote; and I do not yield any further. [Applause.] I am the last man in the world to raise a sectional issue. I have voted for every western proposition that has ever been brought up here, because I believe that what helps one part of the country helps the entire country, and I have voted that way every time since I have been here. I have voted for the Key West, Fla., project when most of my eastern colleagues voted the other way. I voted for the Speedway Hospital in Chicago because I will vote to help our soldier boys every time.

Now, some reference has been made as to who manufactured the clothing which was used during the war. Let me say for the benefit of the gentleman that it was New York, Cleveland, and Chicago that principally manufactured the clothing, but does it make any material difference as to where they came from or of what faith they were? One gentleman rose and spoke of a particular faith, of which I happen to be one, that manufactured the clothing. I did use the words "born American" to distinguish from other Americans, but I never alluded to any particular faith or creed in discussing the manufacture of clothing. I represent, remarkable as it may be, 27 different nationalities who have become American citizens, and my congressional district gave 13,000 boys in the last war. [Applause.] How much more do you want? Is the readiness to die for our country not sufficient proof of our patriotism?

For the benefit of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], I will say to him that he has brought up the question of faith, the Hebrew faith. The people of that faith in the United States gave 257,000 men in the war, and their death rate was 5 per cent on the other side while the death rate of the country at large was a little over 3 per cent. What greater proof of devotion does the gentleman demand?

The brave men and women who have come from all countries have contributed all their might toward advancing the best interests of our common land. Let us throw prejudice to the wind and see the truth.

My dear Mr. Chairman, to those who constantly boast that because their parents were born here this country is solely theirs and refuse to recognize the rights of those who happen to come here after they or their ancestors were born here, let me, for their benefit, quote from a speech made by our beloved martyred President, Abraham Lincoln:

We find ourselves in the peaceful possession of the fairest portion of the earth as regards extent of territory, fertility of soil, and salubrity of climate. We find ourselves under the government of a system of political institutions conducting more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty than any of which the history of former times tells us. We, when mounting the stage of existence, found ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings. We toiled not in the acquirement or establishment of them; they are a legacy bequeathed to us by a once hardy, brave, and patriotic but now lamented and departed race of ancestors. Theirs was the task (and nobly they performed it) to possess themselves, and through themselves us, of this goodly land, and to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights. It is ours only to transmit these—the former unprofaned by the foot of an invader, the latter undecayed by the lapse of time and untorn by usurpation—to the latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know. This task, gratitude to our fathers, justice to ourselves, duty to posterity, and love for our species in general all imperatively require us faithfully to perform.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have only five minutes in which to debate this question, and I shall not refer to the argument which has just been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], who is

not only an honored Member of this House but a very able Member, except to say that he and I have two different viewpoints about our constituents. He seems to imagine that because he has a constituency of a certain class of men in large numbers that it is his duty to get upon the floor of the House and by different amendments and speeches, which he can send back to them, induce them to think that he is making a great fight for them. He seems to think that they are well pleased when he gets up and brags on them. I have the same sort of constituents as has the gentleman from New York, many different nationalities, and, as the gentleman says, they have the right to vote when they take out the first papers. But these people do not expect me to get up and brag on them; they can brag on themselves. They expect me to come here and stand for sound legislation which will be for their best interests. [Applause.]

Now, to get back to this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York. This amendment proposes that as one of the classes that shall not be counted in the 3 per cent there shall be the following:

Aliens who are fugitives or refugees for political reasons.

And then he follows it with this rather ambiguous provision:

Provided nothing in this act shall exclude if otherwise admissible persons convicted or who admit the commission, or who seek or advocate the commission, of an offense purely political.

The gentleman took that from the old immigration law.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The present immigration law.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The present law, where we do not restrict the numbers that may come in. That is all right. But in this bill we propose to restrict the number of immigrants that can come in, and he proposes, after the 3 per cent is exhausted, that anybody can come to our doors and say, "The number from my country has reached the limit provided by law, but I admit the commission of a political crime," and we shall say, "Well and good; alight on our shores." He has wholly misinterpreted the spirit of the right of asylum that has grown up as a part of our interpretation of the international law.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I was in the Chamber a moment ago when the question was asked whether membership of the communistic party would not be regarded as political. If there is any punishment because of membership in that party in another country, that would be a reason for the party coming here; and what would be our attitude when a member of the communistic party here of alien subjects may be deported under our present law? We would be admitting an alien under this law who would be deported after he got here.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. To be sure.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is the gentleman of the opinion that if this amendment is adopted all the people in Russia, for instance, who are opposed to the government of Lenin and Trotsky would be permitted to come in?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes; if they were political refugees or if they had been charged with some crime, or if they had been convicted of the commission of an offense which was purely political, or if they teach or advocate the commission of an offense that is political in its nature.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if newspaper reports may be relied upon, the gold from the exchequer of Russia is now being sent to this country in large quantities by those in authority there. Newspapers tell us that it is expected to be followed by the men who are sending it. If that is true it is only a question of time when these leaders over there are going to be political refugees from Russia, because just as soon as the people of Russia find out that they are being robbed by their leaders, that they are being exploited, that the gold of their country is being sent away to become the "booty" of their present leaders, these political refugees, Lenin and Trotsky, are going to be seeking admission here to spend their Russian gold in future years. Do you want to enact a provision that would admit them into this country? The gentleman from New York a moment ago admitted that the communists could come in under this provision. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] said that we would deport them. Where would you deport them to? If they are political refugees from a country, to which in turn they were political refugees from some other country, which is the usual history of such cases, you could not send them back. They would not have any country that would take them. Under this definition Emma

Goldman and Alexander Berkman, who again are soon to be political refugees in Russia, could come in. I understand they want to come back now. I understood they said they would rather be in jail eternally in America than free in Russia, but we had to send them back there, and what are we going to do with the great burning question of properly restricting immigration if we pass an amendment of this kind?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment would be a very unfortunate one at the present time. As was suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], we would be admitting people under this rule of the same character and type we are trying to deport, and some of whom would be subject to deportation as soon as they arrived on our shores.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I have just conversed with the Labor Department upon that question, and they tell me that members of a communistic party now are subject to deportation under the law.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am very glad to have that suggestion. At the present time there is a good deal of turmoil in the various nations of the earth. There are certain places where one side gets into power to-day and another side to-morrow. The first side then takes to the woods, and they would all be political refugees. These seasons of turmoil reappear frequently, and this provision would send a flood tide to America. If you write into this law the terms of the proposed amendment, you absolutely destroy the proposed measure in so far as political refugees are concerned. That would admit any anarchist or bolshevist, any man who fights the country in which he lives or its form of government. The present time, when we are trying to preserve American institutions, I submit, is not a good time to throw open the floodgates and let those from other nations in.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Does the gentleman understand that if this amendment be adopted it would set aside the existing law as to the admissibility of aliens into this country?

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is what I am complaining of. It will allow the present law to remain. I believe the present law ought to be amended.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. The present law forbids the admission of certain people to this country, and does not the present law cut out anarchists?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The present law, so far as this stipulation is concerned, does not do so, and this later law, which would make an exception, would abolish by inference any part of any law in conflict with it, notwithstanding it is cumulative. In other words, the later law would prevail in case of conflict. If the present law forbids the admission of anarchists and bolsheviks, this provision, if enacted into the present law, would repeal such provision, because it would be in conflict with it. This amendment, if adopted, would in specific terms admit any alien who is a fugitive or a refugee in a political sense. Almost anyone from any of the unfortunate countries could come in under such a provision.

Just now when the Old World is in turmoil, debt burdened, and in some instances despairing, we can not take on an unlimited load of foreign immigration. This bill is already liberal enough to admit all we can assimilate for the time being, without leaving a loophole that would admit almost any cunning schemer who may have caused political unrest in his own country.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], I desire to say that if the reading of a letter from an able and distinguished rabbi of my district constitutes the raising of the racial issue, he is entitled to his opinion, but I do not agree with him. In respect to what he said about the manufacture of clothing, shoes, and so forth, I desire only to read from the RECORD, on page 507, of April 21, 1921, as follows:

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman tell of a single American that he knows of that is engaged to-day in the large cities of the country in doing the tailoring of the country? By that I mean the manufacture of the garments that are worn by the people. Can he tell us of a single one? Tell us of a single one engaged in the fur trade. American boys will not do that line of work. Men from the other side of the sea go into that line of work and work hard, and it is those men who supplied the uniforms and the clothing and the shoes for the Army when the war was on, and it ill becomes the gentleman at this moment, on reflection, to refer to them in that manner.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I can not say that I believe in any policy of immigration regulation based on the principle of exclusion. On the

other hand, I believe that our permanent immigration program should be based upon the principle of selection, and I hope that our Immigration Committee will report soon a comprehensive immigration bill based upon the principle of selection. This will permit the selection and admission of those people who can best be assimilated. This will permit of an elastic policy which can be changed as economic conditions change. Furthermore, this selection will also be based upon the desirability of the immigrant upon the question of citizenship. However, there is facing us to-day an emergency, and this is an emergency bill. The amendment before us seeks to extend and enlarge the limitation. If there is a necessity for limiting immigration, as most of us believe, then we should support the principle upon which the bill is based and not enlarge it by extending its exceptions. The amendment in question, it seems to me, is foolish. Under it we would exempt political refugees. In addition we are asked to add to it a proviso which merely restates that which is existing law. The proviso ought to go out altogether. The passage of the provision exempting political refugees would give to political refugees a preference and without any limitation whatever. This would permit them to come in here in hordes regardless of their number. Such a provision ought not to meet with approval from this House. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope gentlemen will give me their attention while I endeavor to explain what I believe to be the purpose and effect of this amendment. Section 2 of this bill proposes to limit immigration to the United States so that the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910. Following that, there are some seven or eight paragraphs making exceptions to that limitation, taking certain classes of individuals out of the limitation, so that without regard to the 3 per cent limitation those people may be admitted. To those classes which under the bill may come in without regard to the 3 per cent limitation, it is now proposed to add another class, to wit, aliens who are fugitives or refugees for political reasons. Following that very clear and definite definition of a further exempted class, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], seemingly as an afterthought, added a provision which is now in the law, which will be in the law if this bill should pass without this amendment. If this proviso has any purpose whatever, it is to camouflage the first clear, definite, wide-open provision, to cloud the issue and to obscure the situation. Under the amendment that has been offered not only could William the damned come here, but Charles Hapsburg, late Emperor of Austria, and all of the kings and princelings who have been spurned and spewed out by the people of Europe. Not only that; every Russian now opposed to the régime of Lenin and Trotsky would gain admission to our shores, and to-morrow, when, let us hope, the pendulum shall swing and those murderers and thieves shall be driven from their present seats of power, they—Lenin and Trotsky—and all the foul hordes that have followed them, could come in under this amendment and we could not close the doors against them, even though they were avowed anarchists. That is what this amendment would do. Of course, we are all for America first, but the best way to prove that, should anyone question it, is not by words, but by votes. [Applause.] That is what we are called upon to do now. He that provideth not for his own household is worse than an infidel, and what shall it profit America if she shall afford asylum to all the earth and lose her own soul. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the order of the committee has been used. The first vote is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Page 4, after the Cooper amendment, insert new paragraph:

"Aliens who are fugitives for political reasons."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 2 add the following:

"Provided further, That the entry of Donal O'Callaghan, a citizen of Ireland, who is a political refugee, is hereby authorized, and he be permitted to remain in the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington and Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That the provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to offer an amendment to the pending section?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, at end of line 17, add the following:

"Provided further, That in addition to the foregoing the Secretary of Labor may in individual cases admit aliens when, in his opinion, such action is justifiable as a measure of humanity."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. If no other gentleman desires to offer an amendment to the section the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York to offer a new section, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIEGEL: Page 7, line 17, insert a new section, to be section 5:

"That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to make or cause to be made an inquiry into the condition of aliens within the United States as affected by conditions existing in various foreign countries; the policies under consideration or adopted by foreign governments with regard to immigration; the treaties that have been entered into or are being considered with respect thereto; the relations between the foreign governments and their nationals within the United States; the protection of aliens by Federal, State, and municipal laws and regulations; the efficacy of the laws enacted on the subject and the need for further legislation; and, in general, the status of aliens in this country as affected by treaties between the United States and the country of which they are or have been subjects."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, and Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will ask the gentlemen to reserve the point of order, as I want to explain—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order, for the reason that we have passed section 4 for amendment and are considering amendments suggesting additional sections. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That this act shall take effect and be enforced on and after May 10, 1921 (except sections 1 and 3 and subdivision (c) of section 2, which shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act), and shall continue in force until June 30, 1922, and the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted during the time between May 10, 1921, and the close of the current fiscal year shall be limited to one-sixth of the number who are admissible annually as provided in section 2 of this act.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 7, line 20, strike out the word "subdivision" and insert in lieu thereof "subdivisions (b) and (c)."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if there are no other amendments, I move that—

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to section 5, if there is time in which to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An amendment offered by Mr. ROSSDALE: Add to section 5 the following:

"The Commissioner General of Immigration, by and under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, be empowered to formulate plans, rules, and regulations to distribute and to regulate immigrants arriving in the United States with the end in view to their settling in sparsely settled communities and to avoid congestion in crowded centers of the United States, and to report the same to the House and Senate at the next regular session of the Sixty-seventh Congress."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane; further that there is no such official as the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, as mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane, inas-

much as there is no such official as the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. The Chair sustains the point of order, because it is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Is there anybody who wishes to offer a further amendment—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee having completed the consideration of the bill, and no further amendments being offered for consideration, the committee automatically rises pursuant to the rule under which this bill is considered, and the Chairman will report the bill to the House with the various amendments that have been agreed to.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STAFFORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4075, had completed consideration of such bill, and that the committee during such consideration had adopted various amendments, and that he reported the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. By the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and it was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum, in order to get a record vote. Pending that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman can not ask for the yeas and nays pending the point of no quorum. Does the gentleman make the point of no quorum?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays, and pending that I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the minority leader, I withdraw the request.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York renews the request. The Chair will count. [After counting.] There are many more than a quorum present.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had just counted the House.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a dispatch which has been received in regard to the immigration proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, what was the request of the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill, and the gentleman from Washington makes the same request.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. VAILE, Mr. SABATH, Mr. JONES of Texas, and Mr. RAKER made the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the gentlemen extending their own remarks, but with the understanding that they do not include letters and telegrams and things of that sort.

The SPEAKER. With the limitation that the extension shall be of their own remarks.

Mr. BLACK. And such extracts from publications as they may wish to quote, but not to include letters and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. And that the extension shall not include letters or telegrams. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIEGEL. I wish to include a telegram that I have received from an organization protesting against some language that has come out here on the floor of the House, involving some 800,000 people.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not press that request this afternoon. Will the gentleman defer the request until the House meets again?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will have to object if it is made now. I have an explanation which I desire to make.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request. It is not very important.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FLOOD, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order, until Monday, April 23, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

50. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$36,852,000 required by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation for the current fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

51. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations in the sum of \$162,608.89 required by the Department of Labor for sundry fiscal years (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

52. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$5,421.05 to pay claims for damages adjusted by the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 26); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

53. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$36,702.70 required for printing and binding for the National Museum and Bureau of American Ethnology, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 27); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

54. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting from the United States Shipping Board, supplemental estimate of appropriation required for salaries for commissioners, etc. (H. Doc. No. 28); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Agriculture for fuel (H. Doc. No. 29); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

56. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$134,000,000 required by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation for the fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Agriculture for consolidation of addressing, duplicating, and mailing work (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting proposed item of legislation making available for expenditure appropriation in connection with wind-thrown timber in the Olympic National Park (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation to cover traveling expenses, United States Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriation required by the Post Office Department for sundry fiscal years (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for the Shiloh Military Park, fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Alien Property Custodian regarding motor-propelled vehicle (H. Doc. No. 36); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

63. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, from Federal Board for Vocational Education, supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$15,000,000, required for vocational rehabilitation, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

64. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Treasury Department for fiscal years 1921 and 1922, salaries, office of the Secretary of the Treasury (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

65. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State for relief and protection of American seamen, etc. (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

66. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Agriculture under General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

67. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Government Printing Office for general expenses and distribution of public documents, office of the superintendent of documents, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

68. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce for sundry fiscal years (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

69. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the Panama Canal, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

70. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting item of appropriation for the construction of a vault, Treasury Building, Washington, D. C. (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which were referred the bill (H. R. 4803) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 12), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4810) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 13), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 4895) to provide employment for returned soldiers, to open up the unused lands

and natural resources of the United States for the use of the returned soldiers and other citizens who may desire access to them, and to promote the general welfare of all the people of the United States, and to establish an executive department of the United States, to be known as the department of land and natural resources; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4896) to incorporate the American Volunteers of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4897) for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 4898) to declare the Tombigbee River nonnavigable from its source to its intersection with the boundary line between Itawamba and Monroe Counties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 4899) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 4900) to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4901) to establish the standard of weights and measures for the following wheat-mill and corn-mill products, namely, flours, hominy, grits, and meals, and all commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 4902) for the erection of a Federal building at Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 4903) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to vacate and close a part of M Street NW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4904) fixing the compensation of certain officials of the Customs Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4905) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations," approved November 7, 1918, and to provide for the consolidation of State banks with national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) to amend section 10 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved March 3, 1919; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 4907) to amend section 305 of the war risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. A. P. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 4908) to create a farm-loan revolving fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 4909) to authorize the President to present certain ordnance and ammunition to the Portuguese Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 4910) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Bryson City, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4911) making an appropriation for compensation of the personnel of the steamer *Gannet*, of the Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 4912) for the erection of a public building at Hickman, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) for the erection of a public building at Murray, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 4914) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Sylva, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain equipment to the Modern Woodmen of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) authorizing the establishment of a free port of entry at Galveston, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) for negotiations with Great Britain and Japan with a view to decrease in naval expenditures and programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) creating a commission to represent the United States in the celebration of the first centennial of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution (H. Res. 66) directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 67) directing the Secretary of War to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Resolution (H. Res. 68) requesting the Attorney General to report certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECK: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to construct, erect, build, and maintain a bridge across the Mississippi River between the city of Prairie du Chien, in the State of Wisconsin, and the cities of McGregor and Marquette (North McGregor), in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing and urging the Congress of the United States to direct immediate Federal action to control profiteering in the necessities of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to refrain from placing a duty on lumber imported from the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, favoring legislation which will provide retirement privileges for disabled emergency officers of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 4915) granting a pension to Francis Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Augustus Gosling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BIXLER: A bill (H. R. 4917) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Sharpsville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 4918) for the relief of Clara Thurnes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 4919) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of Rhode Island a certain howitzer, with carriage and limber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4920) for the relief of E. J. Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 4921) granting a pension to Carrie Shanahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 4922) granting a pension to Margaret J. Wadsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 4923) for the relief of the owner of the derrick *Capitol*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 4924) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph D. Hazzard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) for the relief of William W. Fineren; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4926) granting a pension to Clara D. Rehner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4927) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Lee Draper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 4928) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plainville, State of Connecticut, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wethersfield, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 4930) for the relief of William J. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 4931) granting a pension to Hannah Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4932) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cloverport, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4933) granting a pension to W. W. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 4934) granting a pension to Florence Schloth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) granting a pension to George Buzan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4936) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Buffalo, State of New York, three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lackawanna, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 4938) for the relief of Abraham M. Auten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 4939) to reimburse James J. Burns, jr., for damages to touring car by Government-owned motor truck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4940) to compensate the firm of Rothwell Bros. for repair work for the United States at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) for the relief of Irene Gillespie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manchester, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jennings, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ferguson, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wellston, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to University City, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kirkwood, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Maplewood, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clayton, St. Louis County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Webster Groves, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Louis, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4952) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Oaklyn, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4953) granting a pension to Violette F. McCool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 4954) for the relief of the father and next of kin of Catherine Kearney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4955) granting a pension to Ella E. Carbo-nell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4956) for the relief of Robinson Newbold; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROSENBLUM: A bill (H. R. 4957) granting a pension to George W. Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4958) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Jaques; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 4959) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHELTON: A bill (H. R. 4960) granting an increase of pension to George Tuttle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting a pension to Martha Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Richland, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 4964) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Palmer College, of De Funiak Springs, State of Florida, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee, State of Florida, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the towns of Pensacola, Milton, Crestview, De Funiak Springs, Vernon, Panama City, Quincy, Marianna, Bonifay, Blountstown, Tallahassee, Crawfordville, Bristol, and Apalachicola, State of Florida, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 4967) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clearbrook, Clearwater County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Jacob James; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 4969) granting an increase of pension to Claudie O. Neff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 4970) granting a pension to Carrie E. Aram; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

262. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, favoring equitable reclassification of Federal employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

263. Also, petition of a mass meeting held in San Francisco, Calif., favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

264. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of Washington Davis and 20 other citizens of Huntersville, N. C., requesting Congress to enact legislation to aid in the relief of the starving Chinese; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

265. By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of Newport, R. I., urging the reestablishment of the second naval district; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

266. Also, resolution of the Board of Aldermen of Newport, R. I., protesting against the proposed removal of the Naval War College from Newport, R. I., to Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

267. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the City Gardens Club of New York, favoring further relief for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

268. Also, petition of the National Immigration Council, in connection with immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

269. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of U. S. Kipp and other citizens of Melvin, Mich., protesting against any revision of the tariff on those classes of coal-tar products that are used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants, and such other materials as are used in making insecticides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

270. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Harry Zierler Co. and Kaye & Einstein (Inc.), against 10 per cent tax on furs; T. W. Bentley, regarding tariff and silk production; Gem Toy Co., regarding tariff on dolls; and Chelsea Fibre Mills, in connection with Schedule J; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

271. Also, petition of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, favoring recognition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

272. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, North Tonawanda, N. Y., favoring Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

273. Also, petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, favoring the McFadden bill for protection of monetary gold reserve; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

274. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of L. C. Retau, with reference to tariff on honey and wax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

275. By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of Seter Kind and 154 other residents of Chicago, Ill., favoring amendment of Volstead prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

276. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition of Columbus Lodge, No. 175, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in opposition to sales tax

and repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

277. Also, petition of Penn Lodge, No. 141, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in opposition to sales tax and repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. By Mr. TEN EYCK (by request): Petition signed by citizens of the twenty-eighth district of New York, to repeal the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 25, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we give Thee thanks for all the blessings vouchsafed unto us, for yesterday and its rest and its inspiration, and pray that help from the sanctuary may go with us through the toil and tasks of the week. Help us ever to remember Thee, and may our land be exalted in righteousness to the glory of Thy great name. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

JOHN K. SHIELDS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ORDNANCE PATENTS TO GERMAN CITIZENS (S. DOC. NO. 6).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, inviting attention to the fact that there have been issued to German citizens in the United States Patent Office 201 patents pertaining to ordnance, which patents have been assigned to Frederick Krupp, of Essen, Germany, etc., and recommending corrective legislation in the premises, which was referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed.

NEAR EAST RELIEF (S. DOC. NO. 5).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a complete report of the Near East Relief for the year ending December 31, 1920, which the trustees of that corporation desire substituted for the incomplete report laid before the Senate March 7, 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TREATMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the close of the routine morning business on Wednesday I shall make some observations on the governmental facilities for the care and compensation of veterans of the World War, and shall suggest some changes in existing laws for their welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States at Philadelphia on April 12, 1921, favoring the restoration of the monument of Abraham Lincoln to its former location in front of the courthouse in Judiciary Square, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. RANDELL presented 54 petitions signed by 1,620 citizens of the State of Louisiana, praying that the republic of Ireland be recognized, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COLT presented a resolution of the board of aldermen of Newport, R. I., protesting against the enactment of legislation for the removal of the Naval War College from Newport, R. I., to Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a resolution of the board of aldermen of Newport, R. I., favoring the enactment of legislation to re-establish the second naval district and to maintain it until the present system of naval districts is abandoned and administrative authority is centered in the Navy Department, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of Division No. 237, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fort Scott, and Local No. 1610, Fancy Creek Farmers' Union, of Riley

County, both in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax law and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rochelle, Adel, Doerun, Morven, Ty Ty, Sumner, Ambrose, Willacoochee, Ray City, Montezuma, Warwick, Smithville, Pearson, Alapaha, Fender, Nashville, Hinsonton, Omega, McRae, and Empress, all in the State of Georgia, praying for a reduction in freight rates on watermelons, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PEACE WITH GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, and for other purposes. I give notice that I shall call up the joint resolution to-morrow immediately after the routine morning business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator proposes to make it the unfinished business to-morrow, I understand?

Mr. LODGE. That is my plan.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose the Senator intends to let the resolution run a reasonable time before pushing it to a conclusion.

Mr. LODGE. I, of course, expect to have debate on it. I should like to get it through as soon as may be.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Probably to-morrow or the next day Senators on this side of the Chamber will not be prepared to carry on the debate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can relieve his mind in one respect. I have no intention of making a speech upon the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I may wish to make some remarks on it myself, but I shall not be prepared to do so to-morrow. It is not that I think there is any disposition on this side of the Chamber to delay it unduly, but I suppose the Senator does not intend to push it for a day or two or until an opportunity is given to discuss it.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not propose to be unreasonable about it, at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF TREATIES.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask to have printed as a Senate document various treaties in the possession of the Senate, including copies of treaties which have never been sent to it, the treaty of peace with Turkey, the treaty of peace with Hungary, and certain other agreements reached by the peace conference at Paris. I ask permission that the order shall cover also a treaty, which I have not here at this moment, between Bulgaria and the allied and associated powers.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, under the order just requested, how many copies will be printed?

Mr. SMOOT. About 1,674, I may say to the Senator. Most of them go to the libraries throughout the country. Each Senator will be entitled to two copies.

Mr. LODGE. If we desire to have more copies printed, that is very easily done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not desire any more. I think if each Senator has two, that will be sufficient. The Senator from Utah states that copies will go to all the libraries of the country, and that is the matter in which I have particular interest.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether it is the purpose to have these treaties printed as one document?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; to have them printed as one document.

Mr. KING. Or will each be treated separately?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am going to have them printed as one document, which I think will be more convenient.

Mr. KING. I think so, too.

Mr. LODGE. I shall have them arranged with that object in view. One or two more that will come from the State Department will be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is made.

FOREIGN DEPOSITARIES OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Mr. MCLEAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) au-